

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 13

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, 28, 30-32 and 34-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,172,311 to Becker. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). In proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of anticipation based upon the prior art. *In re Sun*, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has not yet met his burden of establishing a prima facie case of anticipation with respect to the rejected claims.

Claim 1 defines a sign system assembly including, among other things, a frame having a face, and a template adapted to fit against the face in an accurate position thereon, with the template having an opening therethrough and a scale thereon. At least one alphanumeric locator is configured to fit within the opening of the template and be properly located in position by aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template. The at least one alphanumeric locator has an aperture therethrough and an alphanumeric symbol for each alphanumeric locator, and each alphanumeric symbol has an adhesive backing. Each aperture has a perimeter corresponding to a periphery of at least one alphanumeric symbol, and the alphanumeric symbol can be accurately positioned on the face of the frame by inserting the alphanumeric symbol through the aperture having the corresponding perimeter and adhering the alphanumeric symbol to the face of the frame.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above noted features of claim 1. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not include a template having a scale thereon. According to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent includes a template 66 having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is the spacing of the openings 68 in the template. However, the

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 14

spacings of the openings 68 of the Becker '331 patent is not a scale on the template body 66. Accordingly, claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-12 and 39-40 depend from claim 1, and since claim 1 defines patentable subject matter as discussed above, claims 2-12 and 39-40 define patentable subject matter. Furthermore, in regard to claim 6, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a template having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is located adjacent two opposite sides of two parallel sides of an opening in a template. The Becker '331 patent not only does not have a scale on a template as discussed above, it does not have a scale located adjacent to opposite sides of an opening in a template.

Moreover, in regard to claim 10, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a panel comprising an outer margin, a template and a guide, wherein the template is removably connected to the outer margin and the guide is removably connected to the template.

According to the Office Action, "Becker teaches the sign assembly including a panel comprising an outer margin, the template and a guide (Figs. 4 and 5A); wherein the template is removably connected to the outer margin and the guide is removably connected to the template (Figs. 4 and 5A, Col. 6, lines 1-50)." Applicants note that Figs. 4 and 5A of the Becker '331 patent are two separate embodiments of the display apparatus as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent. Furthermore, Fig. 4 of the Becker '331 patent does not include the elements used to reject claim 1, the claim from which claim 10 depends. Moreover, the apparatus as disclosed in Fig. 5A does not illustrate a panel that comprises an outer margin, the template and a guide. Notably, the template body 66 is not part of a panel. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Examiner is required to describe how the reference covers the claim if the reference is complex, and Applicants request that the Examiner define the particular parts as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent used to reject the elements of claim 10 and clearly explain how the parts of the Becker '331 patent interact as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2).

Additionally, in regard to claim 12, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest an alphanumeric symbol that includes double sided tape on a rear side thereof, defining an adhesive backing. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not expressly, inherently or

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 15

necessarily disclose that the adhesive used on the letters is a double sided tape. Accordingly, claims 2-12 and 39-40 define patentable subject matter.

Claim 13 defines a sign making system assembly for a frame having a face including, among other things, a template adapted to fit against the face in an accurate position thereon, the template having an opening therethrough and a scale thereon. At least one alphanumeric locator is configured to fit within the opening of the template and be properly located in position by aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template, the at least one alphanumeric locator having an aperture therethrough and an alphanumeric symbol for each alphanumeric locator, each alphanumeric symbol having an adhesive backing. Each aperture has a perimeter corresponding to a periphery of at least one alphanumeric symbol, and the alphanumeric symbol can be accurately positioned on the face of the frame by inserting the alphanumeric symbol through the aperture having the corresponding perimeter and connecting the alphanumeric symbol to the face of the frame.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above noted features of claim 13. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not include a template having a scale thereon. According to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent includes a template 66 having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is the spacing of the openings 68 in the template. However, the spacings of the openings 68 of the Becker '331 patent is not a scale on the template body 66. Accordingly, claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 14-23 and 41-42 depend from claim 13, and since claim 13 defines patentable subject matter as discussed above, claims 14-23 and 41-42 define patentable subject matter. Furthermore, in regard to claim 17, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a template having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is located adjacent two opposite sides of two parallel sides of an opening in a template. The Becker '331 patent not only does not have a scale on a template as discussed above, it does not have a scale located adjacent to opposite sides of an opening in a template.

Moreover, in regard to claim 21, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a panel comprising an outer margin, a template and a guide, wherein the template is removably connected to the outer margin and the guide is removably connected to the template.

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 16

According to the Office Action, "Becker teaches the sign assembly including a panel comprising an outer margin, the template and a guide (Figs. 4 and 5A); wherein the template is removably connected to the outer margin and the guide is removably connected to the template (Figs. 4 and 5A, Col. 6, lines 1-50)." Applicants note that Figs. 4 and 5A of the Becker '331 patent are two separate embodiments of the display apparatus as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent. Furthermore, Fig. 4 of the Becker '331 patent does not include the elements used to reject claim 13, the claim from which claim 21 depends. Moreover, the apparatus as disclosed in Fig. 5A does not illustrate a panel that comprises an outer margin, the template and a guide. Notably, the template body 66 is not part of a panel. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Examiner is required to describe how the reference covers the claim if the reference is complex, and Applicants request that the Examiner define the particular parts as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent used to reject the elements of claim 21 and clearly explain how the parts of the Becker '331 patent interact as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2).

Additionally, in regard to claim 23, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest an alphanumeric symbol that includes double sided tape on a rear side thereof, defining an adhesive backing. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not expressly, inherently or necessarily disclose that the adhesive used on the letters is a double sided tape. Accordingly, claims 14-23 and 41-42 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 24 defines a sign making system assembly for placing alphanumeric symbols on a frame having a face including, among other things, a template adapted to fit against the face of the frame in an accurate position thereon, the template having an opening therethrough and a scale thereon. At least one alphanumeric locator is configured to fit within the opening of the template and be properly located in position by aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template, the at least one alphanumeric locator having an aperture therethrough. Each aperture has a perimeter configured to correspond to a periphery of at least one alphanumeric symbol wherein the alphanumeric symbol can be accurately positioned on the face of the frame by inserting the alphanumeric symbol through the aperture having the corresponding perimeter and connecting the alphanumeric symbol to the face of the frame.

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 17

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above noted features of claim 24. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not include a template having a scale thereon. According to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent includes a template 66 having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is the spacing of the openings 68 in the template. However, the spacings of the openings 68 of the Becker '331 patent is not a scale on the template body 66. Accordingly, claim 24 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 25-33 and 43-44 depend from claim 24, and since claim 24 defines patentable subject matter as discussed above, claims 25-33 and 43-44 define patentable subject matter. Furthermore, in regard to claim 28, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a template having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is located adjacent two opposite sides of two parallel sides of an opening in a template. The Becker '331 patent not only does not have a scale on a template as discussed above, it does not have a scale located adjacent to opposite sides of an opening in a template.

Moreover, in regard to claim 32, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a panel comprising an outer margin, a template and a guide, wherein the template is removably connected to the outer margin and the guide is removably connected to the template. According to the Office Action, "Becker teaches the sign assembly including a panel comprising an outer margin, the template and a guide (Figs. 4 and 5A); wherein the template is removably connected to the outer margin and the guide is removably connected to the template (Figs. 4 and 5A, Col. 6, lines 1-50)." Applicants note that Figs. 4 and 5A of the Becker '331 patent are two separate embodiments of the display apparatus as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent. Furthermore, Fig. 4 of the Becker '331 patent does not include the elements used to reject claim 24, the claim from which claim 32 depends. Moreover, the apparatus as disclosed in Fig. 5A does not illustrate a panel that comprises an outer margin, the template and a guide. Notably, the template 66 is not part of a panel. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Examiner is required to describe how the reference covers the claim if the reference is complex, and Applicants request that the Examiner define the particular parts as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent used to reject the elements of claim 32 and clearly explain how the parts of the Becker '331 patent interact as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2).

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 18

Moreover, in regard to claim 33, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest an alphanumeric symbol that includes double sided tape on a rear side thereof, defining an adhesive backing. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not expressly, inherently or necessarily disclose that the adhesive used on the letters is a double sided tape. Accordingly, claims 25-33 and 43-44 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 34 defines a method for accurately making a sign, including, among other things, providing a frame having a face, providing a template with a scale thereon, providing an opening through the template, placing the template in position against the face of the frame, providing at least one alphanumeric locator, the at least one alphanumeric locator having an aperture therethrough, and locating the at least one alphanumeric locator within the opening of the template and aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template to accurately position the at least one alphanumeric locator. The method further includes providing an alphanumeric symbol for each alphanumeric locator, each alphanumeric symbol having a periphery corresponding to a perimeter of the aperture of one of the at least one alphanumeric locator, inserting the alphanumeric symbol through the aperture in one of the at least one alphanumeric locator, and connecting each alphanumeric symbol to the face of the frame.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above noted features of claim 34. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not include a template with a scale thereon. According to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent includes a template 66 having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is the spacing of the openings 68 in the template. However, the spacings of the openings 68 of the Becker '331 patent is not a scale on the template body 66. Furthermore, the Becker '331 patent does not disclose or suggest aligning a portion of at least one alphanumeric locator with a scale of a template to accurately position the at least one alphanumeric locator. Once the guides 70 of the Becker '331 patent are placed in the openings 68 of the body 66, the guides 70 do not move. Accordingly, the Becker '331 patent does not disclose both locating the at least one alphanumeric locator within the opening of the template and aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template. Accordingly, claim 34 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 19

Claims 35 and 45-46 depend from claim 34, and since claim 34 defines unobvious patentable subject matter as discussed above, claims 35 and 45-46 define patentable subject matter. In regard to claim 35, the Becker '331 patent does not expressly, inherently or necessarily disclose that the adhesive used on the letters is a double sided tape. Accordingly, claims 35 and 45-46 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 36 defines a method for accurately making a sign with a frame having a face including, among other things, providing a template with a scale thereon, providing an opening through the template, placing the template in position against the face of the frame, providing at least one alphanumeric locator, the at least one alphanumeric locator having an aperture therethrough, and locating the at least one alphanumeric locator within the opening of the template and aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template to accurately position the at least one alphanumeric locator. The method further includes providing an alphanumeric symbol for each alphanumeric locator, each alphanumeric symbol having a periphery corresponding to a perimeter of the aperture of one of the at least one alphanumeric locator, inserting the alphanumeric symbol through the aperture in one of the at least one alphanumeric locator, and connecting each alphanumeric symbol to the face of the frame.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above noted features of claim 36. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not include a template with a scale thereon. According to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent includes a template 66 having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is the spacing of the openings 68 in the template. However, the spacings of the openings 68 of the Becker '331 patent is not a scale on the template body 66. Furthermore, the Becker '331 patent does not disclose or suggest aligning a portion of at least one alphanumeric locator with a scale of a template to accurately position the at least one alphanumeric locator. Once the guides 70 of the Becker '331 patent are placed in the openings 68 of the body 66, the guides 70 do not move. Accordingly, the Becker '331 patent does not disclose both locating the at least one alphanumeric locator within the opening of the template in aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template. Accordingly, claim 36 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 20

Claims 37, 47 and 48 depend from claim 36, and since claim 36 defines unobvious patentable subject matter as discussed above, claims 37, 47 and 48 define patentable subject matter. In regard to claim 37, the Becker '331 patent does not expressly, inherently or necessarily disclose that the adhesive used on the letters is a double sided tape. Accordingly, claims 37, 47 and 48 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 38 defines a method of accurately aligning at least one alphanumeric symbol on a face of a frame to make a sign including, among other things, providing a template with a scale thereon, providing an opening through the template, placing the template in position against the face of the frame, providing at least one alphanumeric locator, the at least one alphanumeric locator having an aperture therethrough, and locating the at least one alphanumeric locator within the opening of the template and aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template to accurately position the at least one alphanumeric locator. The method further includes providing each aperture with a perimeter corresponding to a periphery of at least one alphanumeric symbol, inserting the alphanumeric symbol through the aperture in one of the at least one alphanumeric locator, and connecting the at least one alphanumeric symbol to the face of the frame.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above noted features of claim 38. Specifically, the Becker '331 patent does not include a template with a scale thereon. According to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent includes a template 66 having a scale thereon, wherein the scale is the spacing of the openings 68 in the template. However, the spacings of the openings 68 of the Becker '331 patent is not a scale on the template body 66. Furthermore, the Becker '331 patent does not disclose or suggest aligning a portion of at least one alphanumeric locator with a scale of a template to accurately position the at least one alphanumeric locator. Once the guides 70 of the Becker '331 patent are placed in the openings 68 of the body 66, the guides 70 do not move. Accordingly, the Becker '331 patent does not disclose both locating the at least one alphanumeric locator within the opening of the template and aligning a portion of the at least one alphanumeric locator with the scale of the template. Accordingly, claim 38 is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 49 and 50 depend

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 21

from claim 38, and since claim 38 defines patentable subject matter, claims 49 and 50 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 49 and 50 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 18 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Becker '331 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,387,986 to Evans. The requirements for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness are described in MPEP §2143 as follows:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based upon the prior art. *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992); M.P.E.P. §2142. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has not yet met the Examiner's burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the rejected claims. Consequently, the Examiner's rejection of the subject claims is inappropriate, and should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and further defines the scale as comprising a plurality of marks along each of the two opposite sides signifying a distance from a center point of the scale. First, claim 7 depends from claims 1, 5 and 6 and since claims 1, 5 and 6 define patentable subject matter as discussed above, claim 7 defines patentable subject matter. Second, in regard to the first criterion of obviousness, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 22

skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings. According to the Office Action, “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sign assembly of Becker so that the scale would have a plurality of marks along the opposite sides, as taught by Evans, so that a user could more accurately space the desired alphanumeric locators from the center point of the template.” However, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or motivation for making such a modification. The Becker ‘331 patent discloses a template body 66 having openings 68 therein, with each opening 68 configured to accept only one guide 70. Accordingly, a user of the apparatus as disclosed in the Becker ‘331 patent only has the option of placing the guides 70 in one of the openings 68. Accordingly, adding marks to the template body 66 would not allow a user of the system to more accurately space the guides 70 from a center point of the template body because the user has only set places to place the guides 70. Therefore, making the modification as set forth in the Office Action would not allow a user of the modified system to more accurately space the guides 70. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the Becker ‘331 patent with the Evans ‘986 patent as set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and further defines the scale as comprising a plurality of marks along each of the two opposite sides signifying a distance from a center point of the scale. First, claim 18 depends from claims 13, 16 and 17, and since claims 13, 16 and 17 define patentable subject matter as discussed above, claim 18 defines patentable subject matter. Second, in regard to the first criterion of obviousness, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings. According to the Office Action, “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sign assembly of Becker so that the scale would have a plurality of marks along the opposite sides, as taught by Evans, so that a user could more accurately space the desired alphanumeric locators from the center point of the template.” However, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or motivation for making such a modification. The Becker ‘331

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 23

patent discloses a template body 66 having openings 68 therein, with each opening 68 configured to accept only one guide 70. Accordingly, a user of the apparatus as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent only has the option of placing the guides 70 in one of the openings 68. Accordingly, adding marks to the template body 66 would not allow a user of the system to more accurately space the guides 70 from a center point of the template body because the user has only set places to place the guides 70. Therefore, making the modification as set forth in the Office Action would not allow a user of the modified system to more accurately space the guides 70. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the Becker '331 patent with the Evans '986 patent as set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and further defines the scale as comprising a plurality of marks along each of the two opposite sides signifying a distance from a center point of the scale. First, claim 29 depends from claims 24, 27 and 28, and since claims 24, 27 and 28 define patentable subject matter as discussed above, claim 29 defines patentable subject matter. Second, in regard to the first criterion of obviousness, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings. According to the Office Action, "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sign assembly of Becker so that the scale would have a plurality of marks along the opposite sides, as taught by Evans, so that a user could more accurately space the desired alphanumeric locators from the center point of the template." However, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or motivation for making such a modification. The Becker '331 patent discloses a template body 66 having openings 68 therein, with each opening 68 configured to accept only one guide 70. Accordingly, a user of the apparatus as disclosed in the Becker '331 patent only has the option of placing the guides 70 in one of the openings 68. Accordingly, adding marks to the template body 66 would not allow a user of the system to more accurately space the guides 70 from a center point of the template body because the user has only set places to place the guides 70. Therefore, making the modification as set forth in

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 24

the Office Action would not allow a user of the modified system to more accurately space the guides 70. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the Becker '331 patent with the Evans '986 patent as set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, claim 29 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 4, 11, 15, 22 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Becker '331 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,398 to Stanley et al. The requirements for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness are described in M.P.E.P. §2143 as follows:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based upon the prior art. *In re Fritch*, 23 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992); M.P.E.P. §2142. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has not yet met the Examiner's burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the rejected claims. Consequently, the Examiner's rejection of the subject claims is inappropriate, and should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 depends from claims 1-3. As discussed above, claims 1-3 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 4 defines patentable subject matter.

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 25

Claim 11 depends from claims 1 and 10 and further defines the panel as including first perforations defining a first interface between the outer margin and the template and second perforations defining a second interface between the template and the guide, with the second perforations defining the opening in the template, whereby the opening is formed by removing the guide. First, claim 11 depends from claims 1 and 10 and as discussed above, claims 1 and 10 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 11 defines patentable subject matter. Second, according to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent defines a template 66 and a guide 80. However, the element 80 is a screw. There is no suggestion or motivation for making perforations between the template body 66 and a screw. Accordingly, claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 depends from claims 13 and 14. As discussed above, claims 13 and 14 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

Claim 22 depends from claims 13 and 21 and further defines the panel as including first perforations defining a first interface between the outer margin and the template and second perforations defining a second interface between the template and the guide, with the second perforations defining the opening in the template, whereby the opening is formed by removing the guide. First, claim 22 depends from claims 13 and 21 and as discussed above, claims 13 and 21 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 22 defines patentable subject matter. Second, according to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent defines a template 66 and a guide 80. However, the element 80 is a screw. There is no suggestion or motivation for making perforations between the template body 66 and a screw. Accordingly, claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 33 depends from claims 24 and 32 and further defines the panel as including first perforations defining a first interface between the outer margin and the template and second perforations defining a second interface between the template and the guide, with the second perforations defining the opening in the template, whereby the opening is formed by removing the guide. First, claim 33 depends from claims 24 and 32 and as discussed above, claims 24 and 32 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 33 defines patentable subject matter. Second, according to the Office Action, the Becker '331 patent defines a template 66

Applicants : Sharon K. Ernst et al.
Appln. No. : 10/627,139
Page : 26

and a guide 80. However, the element 80 is a screw. There is no suggestion or motivation for making perforations between the template body 66 and a screw. Accordingly, claim 33 is in condition for allowance.

New claims 39-50 are believed to define patentable subject matter.

All pending claims 1-50 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SHARON K. ERNST ET AL.

By: Price, Heneveld, Cooper,
DeWitt & Litton, LLP

9/28/04
Date


Marcus P. Dolce
Registration No. 46 073
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

MPD/msj